

REMARKS

The applicant found a spelling error on page 3 line 19 of the specification and has corrected “acurate” to “accurate”

The examiner objected to claims 22 and 31 for failing to provide a proper antecedent basis for “a chain and wheels” in the specification.

Figure 31 shows the chain and wheels described in claims 22 and 31. Page 19 of the specification has been amended to add the wheels and chain to the specification. Figure 31 has been amended to add reference numbers for the wheel and the chain. A replacement page for Fig 31 is attached with the corrections shown in red.

The examiner objected to claims 23 and 32 for failing to provide a proper antecedent basis for “a circular band” in the specification.

Claims 23 and 32 have been amended from “a circular band” to “a circular track” which has a proper antecedent basis in the specification and drawings. See Figure 36 and the description for Figure 36 on page 20 which describes circular track 37 as claimed in claims 23 and 32.

The examiner objected to claims 30-32 as being a substantial duplication of claims 21-23.

Claims 30-32 were dependent on claim 20. The claims have been amended and are now dependent on claims 29 making them allowable.

The examiner rejected claims 24-29 as being anticipated by Howard.

The examiner rejected claim 24 and stated that Howard has an adjustable template 82 as shown in Fig. 7. However Howard does not have an adjustable template as the examiner stated. The template is made from two semicircular sections 84 and 85 hinged together as at 86 (see Howard column 4 lines 39-60). The size is therefore fixed and not adjustable as the applicant claims in his invention. Further, Howard has a semicircular structure with a fixed prefabricated shape whereas the claims are for an adjustable array for any shape. Therefore Howard does not anticipate the claims as the template in the claims is adjustable and Howard does not have this feature. In Howard the template must be changed to a different template for a different size cut (see Howard column 5 lines 52-54).

Claim 24 is therefore allowable over Howard.

The examiner rejected claims 25-28 and stated in section (a) that Howard has an adjustable template 82 as shown in Fig. 7. As shown above this is not the case. Howard does not have an adjustable template as the examiner stated. The template is made from two semicircular sections 84 and 85 hinged together as at 86 (see Howard column 4 lines 39-60).

Further the examiner stated in section (d) that Howard has a flexible template. This is not true. As Howard states and shows in Fig. 7 there are two semicircular sections, which can't be adjusted to change the shape; they are not flexible but have a solid unchanging shape. The template in Howard is not flexible, therefore Howard does not anticipate the claims.

The examiner rejected claim 29 and stated that Howard has a sleeve considered to be in the broad sense a pin and that the pin does not add any structural limitation to the term sleeve.

The claim limitation is for a flexible track, which Howard does not have. The words "pin sleeve" have been deleted from the claim.

Therefore claim 29 is allowable over the Howard reference.

The examiner stated claims 14-23 were allowed.

The examiner stated claims 1-13 were allowable if the double patenting correction was made.

The applicant has submitted herewith a terminal disclaimer overcoming the examiner's the double patenting objection.

It is submitted that with terminal disclaimer to patent 6,601,312, the amendment made to the claims and the distinction of the claims over the Howard patent all the claims are now in a condition for allowance.



FIG. 31